

FILED

DEC 10 2009

RICHARD W. WIEKING
CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN JOSE

JOSEPH P. RUSSONIELLO (CASBN 44332)
United States Attorney

BRIAN J. STRETCH (CASBN 163973)
Chief, Criminal Division

ROBERT N. MICHAELS (PABN 200918)
Special Assistant United States Attorney

Defense Language Institute – Criminal Law
1336 Plummer Street, Building 275
Monterey, CA 93944
Telephone: (831) 242-4537
FAX: (831) 242-5198

Attorneys for Plaintiff

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SALINAS DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)	Criminal No.: CR-09-00921 MAG
)	
Plaintiff,)	STIPULATION AND ORDER EXCLUDING
)	TIME
vs.)	
)	
MIGUEL ANGEL PULIDO,)	
)	
Defendant.)	

On December 7, 2009, the parties in this case appeared before the Court. The parties jointly requested that the case be continued from December 7, 2009, until February 1, 2010 at 9:00 a.m. for a status conference. In addition, the parties requested an exclusion of time under the Speedy Trial Act, from December 7, 2009 to February 1, 2010. The parties agree and stipulate that an exclusion of time is appropriate for potential disposition.

/

/

/

/

STIPULATION AND ORDER EXCLUDING TIME 1
CASE NO: CR-09-00921 MAG

1 SO STIPULATED:

JOSEPH P. RUSSONIELLO
United States Attorney

2
3 DATED:

4 /S/
ROBERT N. MICHAELS
Special Assistant United States Attorney

5
6
7 DATED:

8 /S/
NICK HUMY
Counsel for MIGUEL ANGEL PULIDO

9
10 ORDER

11 Accordingly, for good cause shown, the Court HEREBY ORDERS that time be excluded
12 under the Speedy Trial Act from December 7, 2009 to February 1, 2010. The Court finds, based
13 on the aforementioned reasons, that the ends of justice are served by granting the requested
14 continuance and outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. The
15 failure to grant the requested continuance would deny defense counsel reasonable time necessary
16 for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence, and would result in a
17 miscarriage of justice. The Court therefore concludes that this exclusion of time should be made
18 under 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(A) and (B)(iv).

19 IT IS SO ORDERED.

20 DATED: 12/10/09

21 
HOWARD R. LLOYD
United States Magistrate Judge